



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/596,600

04/03/2007

Patrick Leahy

3994942

8346

23570

7590

02/19/2010

PORTER WRIGHT MORRIS & ARTHUR, LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP

41 SOUTH HIGH STREET

28TH FLOOR

COLUMBUS, OH 43215

EXAMINER

BOOTH, MICHAEL JOHN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3774

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/19/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/596,600	Applicant(s) LEAHY, PATRICK	
	Examiner MICHAEL J. BOOTH	Art Unit 3774	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6 and 9-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 9-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/02/2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/02/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Kilcoyne fails to disclose a plurality of apertures. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The flange is interpreted in such that apertures exist on both proximal and distal ends. Thus meeting the claims as broadly claimed. Applicant further argues that Kilcoyne fails to disclose the flange disposed circumferentially about the valve. Examiner respectfully disagrees. *Arguendo*, element 28 meets element 30 and they are circumferentially disposed thereof. Applicant further argues that Kilcoyne fails to disclose the plurality of apertures opening onto a stomach facing side of the flange. The device of Kilcoyne may be arranged in such that meets the limitation and is thus capable of doing such.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments. The claims as written are broad and it is the duty of the Examiner to give the claims its broadest reasonable interpretation.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-4, 6, and 9-17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1 and 6 recites “onto a stomach contacting side” which positively requires the human body.

Claim 1 amendment deletes “substantially” where no support for such exists in the specification.

Claim 4 recites a “mitral valve” which claims a human body part.

Claim 15 is not consistent with claim 1, whereby claim 1 deletes “substantially” and claim 15 retains said term.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 6, 9-12 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kilcoyne et al USPN 6,264,700 “Kilcoyne”.

With respect to claims 1-3, 6, 9-12; Kilcoyne discloses a valve (20) that permits unidirectional flow and allows reverse flow when a pressure meets a certain threshold. (column 7, lines 18-26 and 40-56). The valve comprises a retention means (namely an anchor, 18) which secures the valve into a wall. The material used allows the valve to be flexible and collapsible (column 2, lines 39-48) and is biodegradable. Kilcoyne

Art Unit: 3774

discloses a retention means, or more specifically a flange (namely an anchor, 18, which qualifies as a flange, which is a retention means) where the flange may contain an adhesive. (column 4, lines 16-32). Further, the flange defines a conduit, where the flange comprises apertures (38). The valve is to be positioned with the retention members against the wall (abstract) and is distensible due to the material used and is adapted to be clamped to the wall. The term “substantially” is interpreted broadly and it is the examiners position that the claim limitation is met, as broadly interpreted. The flange is disposed “substantially” circumferentially about the valve, and adapted to enable the device to be secured to the stomach wall, as it possesses the capability of performing the function.

With respect to claims 15-17; Kilcoyne discloses the claim limitations as claimed above; further, a dispensing or insertion means (namely a tubular introducer) which is an elongated tube adapted to receive and dispense or insert the device into the stomach. (column 10, lines 3-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 3774

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 4 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kilcoyne as applied to claims 1, 11, and 12 above, and further in view of Taylor USPN 6,254,642.

With respect to claim 4; Kilcoyne discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Kilcoyne does not disclose a mitral valve. Taylor discloses a mitral valve (column 6, lines 20-39) for the purpose of easier implantation. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kilcoyne's valve with the teachings of Taylor with respect to the mitral valve in order to allow for easier implantation.

With respect to claims 13-14; Kilcoyne discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Kilcoyne does not disclose a tether detachably engageable with the distensible element to allow the element to be drawn against the stomach, further with an inflatable balloon. Taylor discloses an inflatable balloon to allow the element to be drawn against the stomach wall (column 2 & 3) for the purpose of allowing the retention members (namely the anchors) engage with the wall during implantation. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kilcoyne with an inflatable balloon in order to engage the retention members with the wall during implantation.

Conclusion

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered previously. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL J. BOOTH whose telephone number is (571) 270-7027. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 9:00am - 7:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David J. Isabella can be reached on (571) 272-4749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3774

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael J Booth/
Examiner, Art Unit 3774
February 4, 2010
/Thomas J Sweet/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3774